Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached Replacement Sheets for Figs. 1, 2 and 3 include text label information in the blocks of the flow chart and diagram of Figs. 1 and 2, as suggested. No new matter has been added, and support is provided by the present application. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Attachment: 2 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 15 and 16 are added without prejudice, and therefore claims 6 to 16 are now pending.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the following.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and for indicating that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

The drawings were objected to as assertedly "vague and unclear". In this regard, Figs. 1 and 2 have been amended to include text label information in blocks of the flow chart and diagram. It is believed that this amendment addresses the objection, which was unclear. No new matter has been added and support is provided by the present application. Entry and approval of the Replacement sheets for Figs. 1, 2 and 3 is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 to 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Drury et al., U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0104842 ("Drury").

To reject a claim as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art must disclose or suggest each claim feature, and the prior art must also provide a motivation or suggestion for combining the features in the manner contemplated by the claim. (See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990)).

Claim 6 as presented relates to a navigation method for use in an on-board vehicle navigation system, the method including determining a route in the on-board vehicle navigation system in a vehicle, and transmitting delta information from the control center to the vehicle information system for use in providing optimized route planning. Claim 6 as presented provides that *the delta information represents only deviations from a previously determined route required to bypass a traffic problem along a section of the route, and that the delta information is transmitted from the control center to the vehicle navigation system only if the traffic problem exists.*

It is respectfully submitted that Drury does not disclose or even suggest the feature of transmitting delta information from a control center to a vehicle information system for use in providing optimized route planning, *in which the delta information represents only deviations from a previously determined route that are required to bypass a traffic problem along a*

section of the route, and in which the delta information is transmitted from the control center to the vehicle navigation system only if the traffic problem exists.

Instead, Drury refers to transmitting ***non-delta*** information from a control center to an in-vehicle system. In particular, paragraphs 162 and 163 of Drury state that the server system determines a route and a spot map, which are sent to the vehicle system that performs a guidance along the planned route. However, if an off-route condition occurs, the in-vehicle system calculates a best route that leads to one of the way points along the previously planned route. (See Drury, page 12, paragraphs 177 and 178). That is, the in-vehicle system of Drury provides a "newly planned" route, which is not restricted merely to the deviations with respect to a traffic problem but which includes the remaining portion of the route as well. See paragraph [0179]. Moreover, it is the in-vehicle system ***alone*** that performs the route guidance along the new planned route. Indeed, there is no suggestion at all by Drury that the in-vehicle system receives delta information with respect to a traffic problem from the control center to guide the car back to the planned route, or that such information would be restricted to pertain only to a bypass section along a previously planned route, as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter, and as required to support the present rejections of claim 6. The Drury reference merely states that if there is an off route condition, the in-vehicle system alone finds a way to guide the car back to the previously planned route.

It is therefore submitted claim 6 is allowable over the Drury reference.

Claims 7, 11 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 6, and are therefore allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 6.

Claims 8 to 10 include features essentially analogous to those of claim 6, and are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 6.

Claims 13 and 14 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 9, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Claims 15 and 16 do not add any new matter and are supported by the present application, including the specification. Claims 15 and 15 depend from claims 6 and 9, respectively, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 6 and 9, respectively.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 to 16 are allowable.

Application Serial No. 10/019,894
Attorney Docket No. 10191/2142
Reply to Office Action dated February 1, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the objections and rejections have been obviated, and that claims 6 to 16 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/1/2006

By: G. A. Messina
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

Reg. No. 33,865 (Adam C. Ostitch)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646